CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	✓ Force	☐ Discourt.	☐ U.S.
Sara Griffin		Squad #4	201903917	☑ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Sunday, 05/05/2019 9:30 PM		§ 87(2)(b)		84	11/5/2020	6/22/2021
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	Date/Time	Received at CCI	RB
Wed, 05/08/2019 12:27 PM		CCRB	Phone	Wed, 05/08	8/2019 12:27 PM	I
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ess			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. POM Maxim Maloshag	3036	956058	084 PCT			
2. POM Craig Schoelermann	19383	962787	084 PCT			
Witness Officer(s)	Shield N	o Tax No	Cmd Name			
1. POM Derek Burgos	21798	959520	084 PCT			
2. POM Toby Lau	11112	964607	084 PCT			
Officer(s)	Allegatio	on		Inve	stigator Recon	nmendation
A.POM Maxim Maloshag	Force: Poagainst	olice Officer Maxim Ma 87(2)(b)	loshag used physica	l force		
B.POM Maxim Maloshag	Abuse: P	Police Officer Maxim Ma in Brooklyn)(b)		
C.POM Craig Schoelermann	Abuse: P	Police Officer Craig Scho	oelermann entered 87 Brooklyn.	(

Case Summary

On May 8, 2019, § 87(2)(b)	called the CCRB and filed	I the following complaint. On May 5,
2019, at approximately 9:30 p.m.		
Schoelermann of the 84th Precinc	t responded to a 911 call re	garding a domestic dispute at
s residence located at § 87(2)	(b)	in Brooklyn. PO Maloshag used
force against § 87(2)(b) (Allegat	ion A: Force, § 87(2)(9)	. PO Maloshag and PO
Schoelermann entered § 87(2)(b)	s residence (Allegations	B and C: Abuse of Authority,
§ 87(2)(g)). No summonses we	re issued or arrests were m	ade regarding the incident.

There is Body Worn Camera footage capturing the incident.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A- Force: Police Officer Maxim Maloshag used physical force against 887(2)(b)

It is undisputed that \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) engaged in a loud verbal dispute inside of their apartment. It is undisputed that a third-party caller called 911 regarding the dispute occurring inside of the \$87(2)(b) residence. The caller stated that a Hispanic female and a Hispanic male were fighting inside the apartment and it was unknown if any weapons were involved (Board Review 1). PO Maloshag and PO Schoerlerman responded to the apartment and were buzzed into the apartment building.

testified (Board Review 2) that the verbal dispute with his wife was loud and lasted approximately three minutes. denied that the dispute with his wife had ever become physical. The officers responded to the apartment approximately three minutes after their dispute ended. The officers knocked on the door and opened the door halfway. PO Maloshag inquired if he could come inside. Solution told PO Maloshag that his wife, Solution was changing and he would let them in shortly. PO Maloshag told solve that he was coming inside. Solution inquired if PO Maloshag had a warrant. PO Maloshag responded that his badge gave him the right to enter. PO Maloshag placed his right hand on solve the solution is chest and pushed him against a wall. Solve solve him as back made contact with the wall. Solve so remained upright after PO Maloshag pushed him.

testified (Board Review 3) that the verbal dispute with her husband lasted approximately 10 minutes, but denied the dispute became physical. Shortly after their argument ceased, the police knocked on the front door, and solution, which sounded like a "boom," from the front of the apartment. Solution could not see the front door from the bedroom.

In a subclip of PO Maloshag's BWC (Board Review 4), the front door to the apartment is opened partially upon the officers' approach. PO Maloshag stands in the doorway and speaks to who is standing near the door inside of the apartment. PO Maloshag steps inside the apartment and looks around a wall and into the living room with his flashlight. PO Maloshag is

Page 2

not observed pushing \$37(2)(b) in the chest nor is PO Maloshag observed making any physical contact with § 87(2)(b) while entering into the apartment. A subclip of PO Schoelermann's BWC (Board Review 5) also captures PO Maloshag entering the apartment and PO Maloshag is not observed using any physical force against § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(g) Allegation B- Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Maxim Maloshag entered § 87(2)(6) in Brooklyn. Allegation C-Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Craig Schoelermann entered § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. It is undisputed that PO Maloshag and PO Schoelermann entered the apartment. testified (Board Review 2) that, after being pushed against the wall, PO PO Maloshag and PO Schoelermann entered the apartment. testified (Board Review 3) that she was in the bedroom when the officers entered the apartment. PO Malsohag testified (Board Review 6) that, prior to this incident, he had responded to the location regarding domestic disputes between \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) approximately five to six times in the last year. On a prior occasion, \$87(2)(b) told PO Maloshag that \$87(2)(b) had tried to kill her. PO Maloshag did not remember the exact date \$87(2)(b) made this statement to him, but believed it was a few months prior to the incident date. On the prior instances when PO Maloshag had responded to the location, both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) would open the door screaming and yelling and would begin to yell at the officers. On the date of incident, the radio call came over as an assault in progress and it was unknown if a weapon was involved. Upon arrival to the location, screaming could be heard coming from the apartment, as it was on the first floor and the apartment's window faces the street. The screaming was coming from both a male and a female. PO Maloshag was unable to make out any specific statements being yelled. Wanting to ensure the welfare of [307(2)(b)] PO Maloshag buzzed every apartment in the building. After being buzzed in and approaching the front door, the screaming from inside the apartment stopped. PO Maloshag knocked on the front door of the apartment. PO Maloshag could not hear any other noises coming from inside of the apartment. [887(2)(b)] opened and cracked the front door. §87(2)(b) appeared pale and sweaty. §87(2)(b) blocked PO Maloshag's view into the apartment. PO Maloshag asked \$87(2)(6) if he could see his wife. \$87(2)(6) responded that PO Maloshag could not see his wife, as she was changing. PO Maloshag told \$87(2)(b) he needed to ensure everyone was okay inside of the apartment. PO Maloshag could not hear \$87(2)(b) s voice while speaking to \$87(2)(b) at the door. PO Maloshag estimated he was speaking for approximately one to two minutes before he walked into the apartment. PO Maloshag denied requesting consent from \$87(2)(b) prior to entering.

Page 3

PO Schoelermann's testimony (Board Review 7) was consistent with PO Maloshag's with the following exceptions. PO Schoelermann had been informed by an officer from the same sector that \$87(2)(b) had alleged \$87(2)(b) attempted to injure her during a previous domestic dispute officers had responded to.

PO Maloshag's BWC (Board Review 8) does not contain audio during the first 30 seconds of the recording. At approximately 0:30, PO Maloshag is at the apartment door and tells the occupants that a loud noise was heard coming from inside their apartment. S87(2)(b) s voice is not heard and she is not visible while PO Maloshag speaks to S87(2)(b) at the door. S87(2)(b) s and S87(2)(b) can be heard. At approximately 1:00, PO Maloshag tells the occupants that he heard S87(2)(b) screaming from outside the apartment. S87(2)(b) responds that he and S87(2)(b) were just talking.

PO Schoelermann's BWC (Board Review 5) was played during both officers' interviews. Reviewing the video did not aid in refreshing both officers' recollections regarding the apartment's front door being open upon approach.

The 911 caller (Board Review 1) reported that a Hispanic female and a Hispanic male were fighting inside of the apartment and it was unknown if any weapons were involved in the dispute. The radio call came over as a "10-34," which is an assault in progress.

A Domestic Incident Report (Board Review 16) was prepared by PO Schoelermann regarding the dispute.

The Constitution is not a barrier to a police officer seeking to help someone in immediate danger, thereby excusing or justifying otherwise impermissible police conduct that is an objectively reasonable response to an apparent exigent situation. The exception is comprised of three elements: (1) the police must have reasonable grounds to believed that there is an emergency at hand and an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property and this belief must be grounded in empirical facts; (2) the search must not be primarily motivated by an intent to arrest or seize evidence; and (3) there must be some reasonable basis, approximating probable cause, to associate the emergency with the area or place to be searched. People v. Doll 21 N.Y.3d 665 (2013) (Board Review 9).

§ 87(2)(g)	

Page 4

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

	st CCRB complaint to wh	has been a party (Boar	rd Review 10).
§ 87(2)(b)			
complaint to v PO Maloshag	which he has been a subject has been a member of se	of-service for two years and this is the ect (Board Review 12). Ervice for five years and has been a substantiated.	bject in six
Review 13).			(Board
review 13).	M-1-4		
	Mediation, C	Civil and Criminal Histories	
	clined to mediate this cor	mplaint.	
[§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)]&(4)] [§ 87(2)(C)]		
On Arrayat 5	2010 a magnest was sub-	witted with the Office of the New York	1. C:4.
	or any notice of claim file	nitted with the Office of the New Yor ed by \$87(2)(b) and/or \$87(2)(b) T	the results are
pending and v	will be added to the case f	file upon its receipt.	
Squad No.:			
<u></u>			
[nvestigator:			
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Squad Leader:			
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date
Reviewer:	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Page 5

Page 6